UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,148	01/23/2004	Hanson S. Gifford	022128-000510US	8153
65689 CIERRA, INC.	7590 06/13/200 &	EXAMINER		
TOWNSEND & TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			JOHNSON III, HENRY M	
TWO EMBAR EIGHTH FLOO	CADERO CENTER OR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO	CO, CA 94111-3834		3739	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			۲
Į.	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/764,148	GIFFORD ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Henry M. Johnson, III	3739	!
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI	PLVIS SET TO EXPIRE 3 M	NITH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS	
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- tiod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON- titute, cause the application to become ABA	CATION. sply be timely filed IHS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06	6 February 2007.		
	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	wance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25 and 27-39</u> is/are pending in the	ne application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6-15,35 and 37-39</u>		deration.	
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>25 and 27-34</u> is/are allowed.	_		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,16-24 and 36</u> is/are rejected.	·		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	inor		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 September 2005</u>		l objected to by the Examiner	
Applicant may not request that any objection to t			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	- · ·		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
 Certified copies of the priority docume 	ents have been received.		
Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in Ap	oplication No	
Copies of the certified copies of the p	•	received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bur			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a l	list of the certified copies not	eceived.	
Amarkananta			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) Intomicos C	ummary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 072205 032006 020607	5) Notice of In 6) Other:	formal Patent Application 	

Application/Control Number: 10/764,148 Page 2

Art Unit: 3739

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of catheter species in the reply filed on April 21, 2006 is acknowledged. The catheter species is in figure 4, not figure 3.

Claims 37-39 are withdrawn by the examiner as dependent on non-elected claim 10.

Claims 1-5, 16-34 and 36 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant should note that the large number of references in the attached IDS have been considered by the examiner in the same manner as other documents in Office search files are considered by the examiner while conducting a search of the prior art in a proper field of search.

See MPEP 609.05(b). Applicant is requested to point out any particular references in the IDS which they believe may be of particular relevance to the instant claimed invention in response to this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the controller ultrasound imaging system" in lines 1-2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 16-17, 19-24 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 01/82778 to Focus Surgery, Inc. WO 01/82778 teaches an ablation system with visualization using transducers to transmit high intensity focused to a tissue target (abstract). Ultrasound transducers (Fig. 2, # 30) are disclosed in a catheter with a proximal and distal end (page 4, lines 10-16). The transducers are used for both HIFU and imaging and can be separately controlled (page 5, line 15-20). The transducers may be phased in a manner to vary the focus of the array (page 5, line 32) thus providing a variable depth and steerable beam (page 8, lines 5-12). This inherently requires a controller and the steerable capability is interpreted as two-dimensional, thus capable of a linear ablation. A display unit is also disclosed.

Regarding claims 22-24, the limitations are based on intended use with no impact on the device structure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3739

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/82778 to Focus Surgery, Inc. WO 01/82778 teaches a display unit operable with the power supply (controller) and transducers. A skilled artesian would include the focus point of the HIFU, as it is intuitive to do so.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3739

Claims 1, 3-5, 16 and 18-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-5 of copending Application No. 11/494387. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are an obvious change in scope based on intended use.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 25 and 27-34 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry M. Johnson, III whose telephone number is (571) 272-4768. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:00 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C. Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/764,148

Art Unit: 3739

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Henry M. Johnson, Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3739